



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/817,371

04/02/2004

Matthias Loeffler

2003DE417

2598

25255

7590

01/06/2009

CLARIANT CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
4000 MONROE ROAD
CHARLOTTE, NC 28205

EXAMINER

BERNSHTEYN, MICHAEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/06/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/817,371	Applicant(s) LOEFFLER ET AL.	
	Examiner MICHAEL M. BERNSHTEYN	Art Unit 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-16, 18 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-16, 18 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/30/2008</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action follows a response filed on October 30, 2008. No claims have been amended, cancelled or added.
2. In view of amendment(s) and remarks the rejection of claims 1-8, 10-16, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph has been withdrawn.
3. Claims 1-8, 10-16, 18 and 19 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of this section of Title 35 U.S.C. not included in this action can be found in a prior Office Action.
5. Claims 1-8 and 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable as obvious over Loffler et al. al. (U. S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0029287, now U. S. Patent 6,437,068) in view of CU Boulder Organic Chemistry Undergraduate Courses (<http://orgchem.colorado.edu/hndbksupport/solremoval/solvremoval.html>), for the rationale recited in paragraph 5 of Office action dated November 28, 2007, and comments below.
6. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable as obvious over Loffler et al. al. (U. S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0029287, now U. S. Patent 6,437,068) in view of CU Boulder Organic Chemistry Undergraduate Courses (<http://orgchem.colorado.edu/hndbksupport/solremoval/solvremoval.html>), for the rationale recited in paragraph 7 of Office action dated April 30, 2008, and comments below.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on October 30, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. It appears that the focal Applicants argument resides in the contention that the polymerization medium is not removed via isolation of the copolymer from the resulting reaction mixture before the solvent or solvent mixture, the one or more emulsifiers, or the mixture thereof was added. Such a method is not taught or suggested by the teachings of the Loftier, et al., reference and the undergraduate course reference, either alone or in combination, and is not obvious over the prior art of record. In stark contrast to the instantly claimed invention, Loftier, et al., in each and every example teach the filtration and drying of the polymer to a fine white powder (page 3, the last paragraph).

9. It is noted again (see the previous Office action dated April 30, 2008) that Loffler fully discloses the limitations of claim 1 (III), steps A), B), and C)) concerning free radically copolymerizing the components a), b) and c) to form the copolymer in a polymerization medium, that behaves largely inertly with regard to free-radical polymerization reactions and permits the formation of high molecular weights; subsequently adding the solvent or solvent mixture, the one or more emulsifiers or the mixture thereof to the mixture of copolymer and polymerization medium from Step A) without isolating the copolymer from the polymerization medium, where the boiling point of the solvent or solvent mixture is at least 10°C higher than that of the polymerization medium used for the polymerization; and removing the polymerization medium from the mixture of Step B) (compare instant claims 15 and 16, which describe in details all

Art Unit: 1796

possible species for the solvent or solvent mixture, and US'287, pages 3-4, [0035]). The only difference concerns the used terminology: the prior art is silent about a higher-boiling solvent and named these species as oil substances.

With regard to the limitations of III), step B) in claim 1, Loffler discloses that the adding of the solvent or solvent mixture and one or more emulsifiers to the mixture of polymer and polymerization medium is the next step after the formation of polymer of high molecular weight. Practically it can be done when the reflux condenser is replaced by a distillation bridge (compare the specification, example A, pages 11-12, [0034] and US'287, Example 1, page 3, [0024] and Examples 1-4 O/W cream, pages 4-5, [0042]-[0060]).

10. Regarding the Applicants arguments that according the definition, "By 'one-pot process' any process is meant wherein the complete process is carried out in one reactor vessel" (page 3, 1st paragraph), it is noted that Example 1 of the prior art clearly discloses that the whole process is carried out in one vessel, and the filtration and drying of the polymer to a fine white powder takes place only in the last stage.

11. In the absence of showing the criticality of adding solvent or solvent mixture, the one or more emulsifiers or the mixture thereof to the mixture of copolymer and polymerization medium from Step A) without isolating the copolymer from the polymerization medium in step B), in view of substantially identical method of free radical polymerization between Loffler and instant claims, and substantially identical chemical ingredients, such as monomers, initiators, crosslinkers, emulsifiers, solvents (tert-butanol), higher-boiling solvents (or oil substances), temperatures, duration, etc. as

Art Unit: 1796

instantly claimed, and being used for the same purposes for cosmetic, pharmaceutical and dermatological oil-in-water emulsion compositions, it is the examiner position that Loffler's process does not necessarily different from the claimed process.

It is worth to mention again, that it is axiomatic that one who performs the steps of a process must necessarily produce all of its advantage. Mere recitation of a newly discovered property or function what is inherently possessed by the things or steps in the prior art does not cause a claim drawn to those things to distinguish over the prior art. *Leinoff v. Louis Milona & Sons, Inc.* 220 USPQ 845 (CAFC 1984).

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael M. Bernshteyn whose telephone number is 571-272-2411. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ling-Siu Choi/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796
/M. M. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/Michael M. Bernshteyn/
Examiner, Art Unit 1796